India

FOR THE

No. 171. NEW SERIES.]
No. 265. OLD SERIES.]

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 1901.

[REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER.] PRICE...... 2D. BY POST, 2½D.

Notes and News 169
Max Müller's Autobiography... ... 172
Our London Letter 173
Notes from Bombay 173
An Indian Famine Union: Suggestion by Sir W. Wedderburn ... 175
The Mortality from Famine 175
Bogus "Recuperativeness" and "Surpluses" 176
The Optimism of the Indian Budget: An Anglo-Indian Protest 177
Mr. G. P. Pillai on Indian Questions 178
Petitions to Parliament 179
Public Meetings on Indian Questions 179
Advertisements 180

NOTES AND NEWS.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN makes, in a letter to the *Times* (reproduced on page 175 of our present issue), a suggestion "that a national union should be formed, on a purely economic basis, having for its specific object to investigate the causes of Indian famines and to determine, by scientific methods, the direction in which practical means of prevention may most usefully be sought." It is earnestly to be hoped that the suggestion will meet with a cordial response from men of all parties. The appearance of the letter in the *Times*, as well as the phrasing of the letter itself, may be taken to indicate that Sir William Wedderburn is anxious, if possible, to avoid anything in the nature of a party movement. Hearty co-operation should at once be forthcoming from the large and influential section who are never tired of expounding the doctrine that Indian questions are not party questions. As regards the detailed suggestions contained in the letter, they are already familiar to our readers. The increasing frequency and severity of famines in India, not for want of food but for want of money or credit to obtain food, should bring home to everybody the duty of making "some organised effort to understand the facts of the case." The prevention of famine in India is the most truly "Imperialist" duty of the time. But prevention must be preceded by enquiry into causes, and it is for the British public to see that this enquiry is undertaken.

To those who have followed the long controversy on the supposed over-population of India the remarks of the Anglo-Indian papers on the results of the Census are most amusing reading. For years we have been told that over-population was the main cause of India's poverty. The Census has revealed that the population is almost stationary, and instead of rejoicing the newspapers are sad. Thus the *Englishman* speaks of this as a "disappointing result." But why "disappointing"? If India suffered from too great a growth of population it surely ought to be a matter of congratulation that the increase has been stayed. The famine was already known. According to the over-population theory, it would have been still worse for India if there had been famine and an increasing population as well. Does not this inconsistency show the irrational character of the theory? Or does the "disappointment" consist in the loss of an argument so useful against all reform, and so vague and indefinite that its opponents found it difficult to grapple with? What will the Anglo-Indian controversialist do without the bogey of over-population?

The succour of orphans and waifs appeals to every human heart, even when there is no special connexion between the children and those who aid them. How much more when both belong to the same race, but are living in a distant land among a strange people! It is therefore natural that the scheme for which the Scotch Church in India is responsible should be received with general applause among Anglo-Indians. The children are to be received into Homes, one of which to hold twenty children was opened last year. The site chosen is in the Eastern Himalayas, Sir John Woodburn acts as President, and they are to be called after St. Andrew, patron Saint of Scotland. No Indian servants are to be kept and the dignity of labour is to be taught. Finally, the Government of Bengal has promised Rs.5 a month for each child and has already given a hundred acres of land for the settlement.

The matter is thus one of public concern, and far as we are from wishing to obstruct any scheme which will really benefit the white children of India, there are some features in this one which might perhaps be reconsidered. First, if the parents of the children are dead or willing to part with them, why should not the children, if of pure European descent, be transported at once to those temperate climes in which they are to make their livelihood. Surely, even the Himalayas are not so bracing as Canada or New Zealand. But—and this is a second point—the scheme is apparently intended to apply to Eurasians as well as Europeans—at least the *Times of India* speaks of children, "either white or with European blood in their veins." But surely the two cases are different. The Eurasian is not a stranger in the land. For him the Himalayas would be excellent, and the training in manual labour and the study of agriculture in what must always be his own country. But why get a Scotchman to teach agriculture to the future colonists of Canada and New Zealand and South Africa on the Himalayas merely because they have been born in India, and why do this partly at the expense of the Indian taxpayers?

In the April number of the *Asiatic Quarterly*, Sir Charles Elliott deals with "the historical and geographical problems arising out of the statistics hitherto published concerning the recent famine." He sets forth elaborate tables of the statistics and comments on them, leaving over the question of the success of the Government measures of relief, and the lessons to be learnt, till the Famine Commission has reported. Sir Charles finds that "the early and rapid rise in the number of the crowds who applied for relief was one of the remarkable characteristics of the famine administration of 1899-1900." He says:—

> In 1896 there were 53,000 applicants for relief at the end of October, 250,000 at the end of November, and 500,000 at the end of December. But in 1899 the figures already amounted to 300,000 by the middle of October; they were 700,000 by the end of that month; over 1,000,000 at the end of November; and 2,500,000 before the year was out.

Again, he remarks on the steadiness with which the numbers mounted:—

> In 1897 there was a gradual rise up to the end of February; then the numbers fell off in March and on to the middle of April, while the spring crops were being reaped, after which they rose again. But in 1900 there was no such break in the steady rise of the gradient.

Further:—

> In 1897 the maximum number was reached in the middle of June; directly the rain broke the people began to disperse to their fields, and by the time the rain-crops were ready in October they had all left, and the works and doles were closed. But in 1900 the maximum was not reached till the middle or end of July; then the exodus set in, but the numbers still remained large till the end of October.

Sir Charles next turns to the volume and geographical distribution of the people on relief, with a view to estimate the intensity of the distress. While the famine of 1896-97 extended over 267,000 square miles with a population of 70,000,000, the famine of 1899-1900 covered 642,500 square miles with a population of 81,000,000, or more than 40 per cent. of the area, and nearly 30 per cent. of the population, of the whole of India. "This is more than double the area that had ever been visited by famine

at one time, and the population affected was larger by 11,000,000 than that of 1896-97, larger by 23,000,000 than that of 1876-78." Now, as to the numbers on relief:

Out of this great population we find that 5 per cent., or 4,040,000 persons, were in receipt of daily relief during an average period of twelve months. In 1896-7 the corresponding figures were 2,290,000 persons, or 3·5 per cent. The number relieved was, therefore, not only larger in volume than ever before, but it was also larger relatively to the population from which it was drawn. This ratio was surprisingly high in some cases. In the eighteen districts of the Central Provinces, inhabited by nearly 11,000,000, 13 per cent. of the number were in receipt of daily relief during twelve months. In the seven districts of Berar the figure was 10 per cent. In the fifteen districts of Bombay it was 7·7 per cent. In the district of Ajmir, with its population of 500,000, 21 per cent. of the inhabitants were continuously on relief for nine months. Altogether, in the whole of the affected British territory, the population stood at 8·5 per cent., or two and a half times as high as in 1896-97.

In the Native States, "where the administrative staff is naturally weaker and the standard of efficiency lower," the liberality of relief fell to 5 per cent. of the whole affected population.

The figures show a considerably higher degree of "intense" famine on the present occasion:—

The "intense" area comprises twenty-six British districts, with a population of 16,250,000, of whom no less than 3,142,000 persons, or 19 per cent., were on relief for an average period of nine months. In 1896-97 this area contained only sixteen districts, with 11,250,000 inhabitants, 17 per cent. of whom were on relief.

On a general review, Sir Charles Elliott concludes that "such wholesale dependence on Government for food over large areas has never been witnessed before," and he thinks it natural to ask "whether relief on so gigantic a scale was really necessary, or whether the people have been demoralised and pauperised by the liberal offer of wages and food without test or restriction, and have flocked to the relief works and the poor-houses merely because their self-respect had been undermined and thought it as well to share in the general scramble." This notion of demoralisation, so elaborately expanded, might well have been kept back by Sir Charles; for, though he is to wait for the report of the Commission before deciding, the evidence already in hand is remarkably strong against the supposition. Sir Charles is rather surprised to find that the total amount of gratuitous relief was less on this than on the preceding occasion—31 per cent of the whole, as against 42 per cent. This is "contrary to expectation, and contrary to the terms of the reports which have appeared from time to time in the public press." Sir Charles reckons the expenditure in fighting the famine at 25¼ crores of rupees, or about £17,000,000 sterling.

The last mail brings us the Government Resolution concerning the appointment of the Famine Commission, the substance of which we have already set out (March 22, p. 134) on the basis of the report transmitted by the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times*. The Governor-General in Council has decided "to reserve for a separate enquiry the question, in its technical aspect, of the relief programmes for public works existing in the several Provinces at the outbreak of the famine, and utilised for the employment of famine labour." He makes this sorry confession:

It is unfortunately the case that in past famines money has been expended on works of little utility, undertaken on the spur of the moment on scanty and doubtful data, because no properly prepared projects were ready, and because of the natural capabilities of the tract, more particularly in the matter of protective irrigation works.

We really do not know what excuse there can be for such neglect.

However, Lord Curzon is going to prepare for future contingencies, and the scope of the enquiries he now promotes is thus stated:—

The main duty of the enquiry would not be to pass a final professional judgment on particular projects, but to deal with the irrigation problem in each tract in its broader aspects, with reference historically to what has actually been done and to recorded results; with reference, next, to such completed or half-completed or conceived projects as may exist; and with reference, lastly, to the need of and scope for irrigation considered in connexion with the physical and climatic peculiarities of the region.

Surely a verbose expression of the glaringly obvious. At the worst, the enquiry will, it is expected, "enable an exact opinion to be formed as to the foundation of charges, not unfrequently heard, that the Indian Government is indifferent to the proper utilisation of the gifts of nature." The charge is much too broadly expressed, but it will be some consolation if the Government do at last find out what irrigation can do and what it cannot do. The series of famines might have jogged its elbow long before now, and it is rather surprising that such an enquiry should be opened only in these latter days.

It is now the fashion to treat the Australians as worthy of special praise for the sacrifices they have made in the cause of Empire by supplying troops to serve in South Africa, chiefly at the expense of the Mother Country. But Australia does not serve the Empire for nought, even on these easy terms. She demands a share in the exploitation of India. The Indian Civil Service, as our readers know, has for some time been an object of her ambition. She, indeed, already possesses the same rights as India does herself. The young Australian, by going to England, can compete on the same terms as the young Indian or the young Englishman. But this is not enough. Australia demands that her sons shall be granted special privileges denied even to the Indians, and that simultaneous examinations for entry into the service shall be held in the Colonies and England. A petition has even been sent, it is said on the advice of Lord Tennyson, from the governing bodies and professors of Australasian Universities, praying that this may be done.

Nay, Professor Morris, of the University of Melbourne, has put forward the views of the Colonists in such a way that even so Imperialist a paper as the *Times of India* comes forward in strong opposition. That Anglo-Indian organ points out that this would seem to imply that there should also be an examination in India. The Anglo-Indian intelligence, with all its prejudices, sees that if the present system is to be altered, if simultaneous examinations are to be introduced at all, those who aspire to rule their own country cannot be excluded from all benefit. But apparently the Professor gets over the difficulty by proposing that Indians shall be excluded from the Civil Service altogether. India is to be congratulated on the sympathetic administrators she is likely to find among the clients of Professor Morris.

The Professor coarsely insists, in a way which still further enrages the *Times of India*, that the exclusion of the Indian is what is aimed at by the present regulations. Our contemporary says:—

He even commits himself to the unfounded and unworthy statement that the examination is now held in London "in the hope that the Native of India will not be able to raise the money to pay for a ticket thither."

The *Times of India* is at great pains to show that this is not the reason. The real reason is the great advantage of passing two years in England—"the Mother Country"—though, if this be necessary, we are not told why residence in England could not follow the examination, so that the expenditure on a profitless journey might be avoided.

The Indian papers are still full of Mr. Pennell's case. Innumerable questions are springing out of the original judgment. Four may be mentioned as giving rise now to a considerable amount of discussion. First, is Mr. Pennell's suspension illegal? Secondly, why, after the Chupra judgment, were so many of those in fault promoted, while Mr. Pennell was sent to Noakhali, one of the worst climates in the Province, and refused leave though obviously in ill-health? Thirdly, how did the Chief Justice know that Mr. Pennell had come to Calcutta when he sent Mr. Chapman to demand the records of the murder case? Mr. Pennell left Noakhali after telegraphing to the Government of Bengal. Was the Chief Justice informed of Mr. Pennell's movements by the Government, or had he private information from Noakhali? Fourthly, was it seemly for judicial officers to request Mr. Pennell to admit Mr. Reilly to bail, when Mr. Reilly's request to be allowed bail had not yet come before them? As to the first of these questions, the illegality of Mr. Pennell's suspension, we express no opinion, but on two of the others something more may be said.

In his Noakhali judgment Mr. Pennell, kept in ill-health at a station which has been described as one of the most unhealthy in Bengal, gives an account of what happened to those officials who were to blame in the

Chupra case. It will be remembered that Mr. Corbett and Mr. Simkins were ultimately convicted of assaulting Narsingh Singh, whose complaint was illegally dismissed by Mr. Macpherson, while Mr. Twidell, Mr. Bradley and Zakir Hosain were accused of persecuting Narsingh Singh or of using their office to shield the guilty, while Mr. Bourdillon and Mr. Bolton were accused of attempting to hush up the affair. Now what has been their fate? Mr. Corbett's promotion was stopped for a year, but he has since been practically restored to his old position. Moreover, he was moved to a specially healthy district and has remained there ever since. Mr. Macpherson, Mr. Bourdillon and Mr. Bolton have been promoted. Mr. Bradley, though rebuked, was appointed District Superintendent of Police at Mozufferpur, the prize district of Bengal, in succession to a very senior officer.

There remain Mr. Twidell and the Moulvi, and of these Mr. Pennell says:—

I was refused leave last year though in bad health, Messrs. Twidell and Zakir Hosain were granted leave on full pay (though, so far as I know, in good health), and were allowed to join it to *Puja* vacation, an extraordinary concession not admissible to judges, even of the High Court.

And again:—

Mr. Twidell and Moulvi Zakir Hosain are still administering injustice at Chupra, with power to try men summarily and inflict three months' rigorous imprisonment without any appeal. Babu Jagannath Sahay, the pleader, who championed Narsingh Singh, has had to remove his practice elsewhere.

The last of the four questions—touching the attempts to get Mr. Pennell to grant bail to Mr. Reilly—certainly requires some answer. It was, perhaps, a small matter that Mr. Cargill, the magistrate at Noakhali, approached Mr. Pennell privately in order to get Mr. Reilly released. But, according to the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, the Government pleader informed Mr. Pennell that the Government was anxious that bail should be granted. Such an interference is said to be very unusual. Finally, the Chief Justice, before any application from Mr. Reilly reached the High Court, telegraphed to Mr. Pennell in these words:—

The Chief Justice wishes to know why bail has been refused in Reilly's case, and urges you to carefully reconsider the matter.

Mr. Pennell sent back a courteous reply, but still refused bail. But why did the Chief Justice interfere in such a manner when the case was not judicially before him, and he could only have drawn his knowledge of the refusal to grant bail from outside sources?

Colonel Pennycuick, R.E., late President of Coopers Hill, writes to the *Times* (April 4) a strongly condemnatory letter on several points of the treatment officially meted out to the College. He remarks that Lord George Hamilton's letter to Sir William Anson repeats "the libels" retailed to the deputation, to the effect that the College "is in such a condition that it must be either reformed or abolished," and that it is "a burden upon the Indian revenues." On this he says:—

Both these statements, unless they have been justified by something that has happened since the end of 1899, are absolutely untrue.

This is pretty direct and strong language, and Colonel Pennycuick backs it up by statements that seem worth Lord G. Hamilton's consideration, for they will certainly weigh with the public:—

At that date (*i.e.*, the end of 1899), the number of candidates for entrance far exceeded the number for whom accommodation was available: the standard of the entrance examination had been steadily raised during the three previous years, and was still further raised in 1900; the College accounts during the same years showed a handsome surplus of income over expenditure; and the reputation of its students for practical efficiency stood at the highest possible level.

It does seem astonishing that matters so readily capable of verification should be presented to the public in such hopelessly conflicting forms.

We have already referred (p. 134, March 22) to the paper read by Mr. F. Loraine Petre, late Commissioner of Allahabad, on "The Indian Secretariats and Their Relation to General Administration," before the East India Association. The paper, with a report of the subsequent discussion, is published in full in the current issue of the *Asiatic Quarterly*. The novelist has now got hold of the picture of the "secretarial-bred official." Mr. Sydney C. Grier, in a new Indian novel of his, "The Warden of the Marches" (William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London), represents the new Commissioner of "Khemistan" as receiving the appointment in consequence of "a beautifully-written minute" demonstrating how to make the province "the garden of India and a lasting memorial of the ruler's happy reign." Not unnaturally, Major North, the Frontier Superintendent at Alibad, is embarrassed and amazed at the new *régime*:—

Funny thing, isn't it, to take a man who knows the Frontier as I do, and let him give five of the best years of his life to working for it night and day, and then to send a jack-in-office who has never seen it to reverse all he's done? It's a queer world.

The proposals of the "unpractical theorist," as Mr. Petre might call the Commissioner, are talked over by Major North and his wife:—

"But, Dick, that would be a direct breach of faith! They couldn't do it—they couldn't! The treaty that really cost my father his life; he had such trouble to get it ratified! Why, it has kept the Frontier safe all these years ——"

"My dear Georgie, that's not what Burgrave and his school think about. You know as well as I do that this province is an anomaly, and has got to be reduced to the level of next-door."

The reader must consult the story for the consequences. The young lady with "a peculiar fascination about her smile which made a slave of the man upon whom it shone" plays a leading part which will have more than a political interest; and the idea of Sinjāj Kīlin Sahib Bahadar (old General St. George Keeling—Mrs. North's father) still riding the frontier in the dusk when trouble is brewing forms a striking imaginative element.

But to return to the discussion upon Mr. Petre's paper. Sir Lepel Griffin, who occupied the chair, made some striking remarks:—

He confessed that he had not much hope, for each man, as he was drawn into the ever-increasing vortex of the secretariat, learned to see with other people's eyes instead of his own. It was very difficult for men of originality to find any place in the Government of India. At this time India was suffering in the higher branches of the service from a stratum of mediocrity due to special causes. . . . . The earth, the soil, the peasant, the agriculturist, is the same to the Indian Civil Service as it was to Antaeus. It is from contact and intimate, daily, hourly association with the people that we renew our strength; and if the increasing demands for reports and statistics and returns tie the District Officer and his English subordinates to their desks, we shall certainly lose our influence with the most important section of the Indian people, the backbone of our revenue system, and the class whose contentment is essential to the maintenance of our rule.

Sir Lepel would have gratified a very legitimate curiosity if he had stated the "special causes" of the present existence of "a stratum of mediocrity" in the higher branches of the service. The very suggestion of such a thing is disquieting.

Mr. Thorburn was not more hopeful than Sir Lepel. He did not think that Lord Curzon would achieve "more than an ephemeral success in grappling with Secretariat evils"; "when he expired as Viceroy his reforms would expire with him." He pointed out "what appeared to be the root of the whole evil."

It consisted in over-government of a machine-like type in what might be called excessive mechanical centralisation. All the Governments of India were top-heavy. They had been built up on a wrong principle, from the top story downwards, instead of from the basement upwards; were a builder to construct a great edifice on similar lines he would be laughed at. But the Government of India was never laughed at; a despotic Government regarded unfavourable comments as hostility or disloyalty, hence it rarely heard the truth.

Mr. Thorburn "thought no permanent reformation would ever come from inside India," and suggested the appointment by the Secretary of State of "a Commission with instructions to examine all the returns submitted to all offices concerned with the government of India, from his own down to that of a Provincial Governor, and let the Commission," he urged, "have a free hand to propose the simplification and reduction of the returns" and to "consider the question of relative expenditure in different offices." Sir Alfred Lyall, while agreeing in the drift of Mr. Petre's conclusions, advanced reasons why he "could not advise sweeping reforms." Mr. Stoker introduced a fresh point: "personally he was not so much frightened by the length of the notes as by the egregious nonsense with which they were stuffed!" Why, "before commencing to reform the Secretariat," which no doubt needed reform, "it might be well to reform the Lieutenant-Governor and the Governor, and perhaps even the Viceroy and the Secretary of State." By all means!

MAX MÜLLER'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.[1]

HERE and there in his voluminous writings Max Müller had given incidental glimpses of his life, and in 1898-99 he had indirectly thrown light upon himself in the recollections of friends commemorated in the two volumes of "Auld Lang Syne." To this indirect mode of self-adumbration he was firmly attached, and it was with a stiff protest that he eventually took to jotting down the reminiscences of his early life which are now given to the world in the present volume. His son, Mr. W. G. Max Müller, who has prepared the work for the press, tells us the point of view of his distinguished father in writing his Autobiography. His object was twofold:—

> Firstly, to show what he considered to have been his mission in life, to lay bare the thread that connected all his labours; and secondly, to encourage young struggling scholars by letting them see how it had been possible for one of themselves, without fortune, a stranger in a strange land, to arrive at the position to which he attained, without ever sacrificing his independence, or abandoning the unprofitable and not very popular subjects to which he had determined to devote his life.

The first object was, indeed, patent; but it is well to have it traced definitely. The second object will no doubt have its results too; but it is not every young struggling scholar that has a famous father and distinguished official relatives, or, while a stranger in a strange land, is taken in hand by his country's Ambassador, on an introduction from one of the most celebrated men of the time. Moreover, though his subjects were at first "unprofitable and not very popular," and he made his way by sheer hard work, yet he does not seem ever to have known anything of circumstances that could justly be described as poverty.

The volume is discursive, even beyond Max Müller's use and wont, but that makes it all the more readable and entertaining. When it is a question of tracing qualities of his own to ancestors or surroundings, he starts off to speculations upon "environment" and "heredity" or "atavism," Darwinism, and Weissmanism; and he will not go back to his youth without illustrating his doubt "whether any historian would accept a statement made thirty years after the event without independent confirmation." Max Müller was born at Dessau on December 6, 1823, his father being librarian of the Ducal library, "and one of the most popular poets in Germany," while his mother was a daughter of Von Basedow, the Prime Minister of the Duchy of Anhalt-Dessau, whose grandfather "was the famous reformer of public education in Germany" in the latter half of the preceding century. His father died when he was but four years old, and his mother was thus left a widow at 28, with two children—Max and a sister, who became Frau Dr. Krug and died early. In his father's life-time the house "was the rallying-point for all the cultivated, scientific, and artistic society of Dessau"; and on his death, if his widow's means were narrow, still everything was cheap and "very little was expected by society," and her relations "were all high in the public service." The influence of the mother was naturally deep and permanent. The Dessau life is effectively sketched. Music had already taken hold of him, as he has related in his "Musical Recollections." A Dr. Hönicke, one of his teachers, was the first to impress on him "that he ought to show himself worthy of his father"—an idea that subsequently "became a strong influence for the whole of his life." A persistent headache gives us glimpses of the famous Dr. Hahnemann, the founder of homœopathy. But from the first he was a bookworm, and his mother's retirement kept him out of society.

Max Müller's "narrow Dessau views" were somewhat widened at school and university in Leipzig. At twelve he went to the Nicolai-Schule at Leipzig, and lived with Professor Carus. His headmaster was Dr. Nobbe, of Ciceronian fame, and other masters were Forbiger, Palm, and Funkhänel, all notable scholars, teaching chiefly classics. He distinguished himself, of course, and his poems were publicly recited on several occasions at great festivities, while he played a good deal privately and "even gave some concerts with Grabau, a great violoncellist, at Merseburg, and at a Count Arnim's"—indeed, he then had thoughts of "devoting himself altogether to the study of music." Baron von Hagedorn, a very rich man, who had been brought up by a great-aunt of Max Müller's,

> was also a great friend of my cousin who was married to a Prince of Dessau, and they had agreed among themselves that I should go to the Oriental Academy at Vienna, learn Oriental languages, and then enter the diplomatic service. As there were no children from the Prince's marriage, I was to be adopted by him, and, as if the princely fortune was not enough to tempt me, I was told that even a wife had been chosen for me, and that I should have a new name and title, after being adopted by the Prince.

But the proposal was rejected, as "it seemed to interfere with my freedom, with my studies, with my ideal of a career in life." Still Hagedorn continued his kind interest. During Max Müller's two and a half years at Leipzig University his mother and sister kept house for him. He "enjoyed his student life thoroughly," working gradually on to Eastern lines of study, drinking his beer, fighting his duels, and even getting his "taste of prison life for the offence of wearing the ribbon of a club which the police regarded with disfavour," but declining "to invest in evening dress." He explains in some detail the course of his Leipzig studies and the influences of his professors. But he longed to hear Bopp and to know Schelling—for his philosophical interest was keenly whetted—and so he went to Berlin University in 1844. Bopp proved rather disappointing, mainly from physical infirmities, and we hear nothing of Schelling. In 1845-46, Max Müller was in Paris, under the wing of Hagedorn, his mind open on a new world and working hard in the Bibliothèque Royale on the MSS of the *Kathaka Upanishad*, his great mentor being Burnouf, under whom he studied Sanskrit, class companions being Barthélemy St. Hilaire, l'Abbé Bardelli, Roth, and Goldstücker. He confesses that he "never can adequately express his debt of gratitude" to Burnouf. It was on Burnouf's advice that he decided to devote himself to the Rig-Veda. But the need of some essential MSS brought him to London, to the Library of the East India Company, in 1846, and Bunsen induced the board of directors to undertake the publication of the great work. "If I owed much to Burnouf," he writes, "how can I tell what I owed to Bunsen?" The account of his intercourse with Bunsen is extremely interesting, and his hopeless difficulties with English etiquette are vastly amusing.

It was the printing of the Rig-Veda that took Max Müller first to Oxford. There he was well received, and gradually (though intermittently) advanced to honours. The description of Oxford—the University and Colleges, the men, women, and ways of the place—is full of variety and humour, with touches of caustic criticism. But the story breaks off already in the "early days," when Oxford was a very different place from what it is now. Some of the stories are distinctly good. Take this, of Dr. Jenkins, Master of Balliol:—

> The Master's regard for his own dignity was very great. Once, when returning from a solitary walk, he slipped and fell. Two undergraduates seeing the accident ran to assist him, and were just laying hands on him to lift him up when he descried a Master of Arts coming. "Stop," he cried, "stop, I see a Master of Arts coming down the street." And he dismissed the undergraduates with many thanks, and was helped on to his legs by the M.A.

There is a pretty story of Dr. Gaisford, Dean of Christ Church, who though sometimes rough on inferior academic mortals, "showed me more of real courtesy in those days than anybody else in Oxford." The Dean and Max Müller had both just been elected Members of the Bavarian Academy, and Max Müller asked him whether he would put his name on the books of the House:—

> He certainly hesitated a little, and asked me at last to come again next day and dine with him. I went, but I confess I was rather afraid that the Dean would raise difficulties. However, he spoke to me very nicely. "I have looked through the books," he said, "and I find two precedents of Germans being members of the House, one of the name of Wernerus, and another of the name of Nitzschius," or some such name. "But," he continued, smiling, "Even if I had not found these names, I should not have minded making a precedent in your case."

There is much of interest in the special chapter on "Early Friends at Oxford," but it is severely dashed by inscrutable and astounding details of religious and ecclesiastical conflicts that are now but curiosities of strange phases of the human mind. The final chapter is "A Confession," of which the text is: "I have never done anything; I have never been a doer, a canvasser, a wirepuller, a manager, in the ordinary sense of these words." Surely a scholar and a thinker need not apologise for desiring "freedom

[1] "My Autobiography: A Fragment." By the Right Hon. Professor F. Max Müller, K.M. With Portraits. 12s. 6d. (London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.)

from canvassing, from letter-reading and letter-writing, from committees, deputations, meetings, public dinners, and all the rest." No doubt he was much better occupied.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Westminster, Thursday.

A SINGULARLY dull vacation testifies to the indifference with which the public have come to regard matters of political controversy. Time was when the Easter recess was a vacation only in name, when the country was stirred from end to end with the strife of the platform, when judgment was invoked in passionate speech on deeds accomplished and eager appeals were uttered in the hope of eliciting a popular mandate for or against some hotly debated act of Government or of legislation. We are all too lethargic nowadays to spend a holiday in fighting our battles over again. Besides, there is no burning question to agitate the public mind. Everyone is waiting for the Budget, or, rather, for the penalties in taxation with which the annual stocktaking is certain to be accompanied. The party leaders, too, are disabled. Lord Salisbury is seeking a renewal of health in the South of France, while Lord Kimberley, after a protracted illness, is slowly fighting his way back to convalescence at home. Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain have been battered too severely in the House of Commons to desire a renewal of the conflict on the platform, and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman is guarding the Straits of Dover.

If the Liberal leader had not already been in possession, Lord Salisbury would probably have been tempted to break his southward journey at Dover last Saturday. The Prime Minister is a wretched sailor, and the Channel is no respecter of persons. It was supposed to be on its good behaviour on Saturday; but, all the same, the distinguished invalid had an unpleasant passage. The fact that he was considered well enough to face the ordeal ought perhaps to be regarded as reassuring. Hitherto Lord Salisbury has been able to shake off his illnesses with wonderful ease. He looked pale and haggard on the morning of his departure, but those who have noticed his powers of recuperation are confident that he will return in the course of a few weeks completely reinvigorated. Meanwhile, the French papers, with something less than the traditional tact of their nation, are signalising Lord Salisbury's arrival in France by discussing the contingency of his resignation or supersession. Our neighbours evidently believe that after Lord Salisbury will come the deluge, in the person of Mr. Chamberlain. They do not understand our ways; otherwise they would see that this country is more likely to prefer the stolidity of Chatsworth to the fluidity of Highbury.

A cry of astonishment has gone up because one of the most distinguished men in the ranks of literature was the other day allowed to die, as he had lived, plain Mr. Smith. Perhaps the neglect of the Crown was thought the more inexplicable because Mr. Smith, though the cause of literature in others, was himself scarcely an author at all. If the truth were known, it would probably be found that this generous, cultured, and eminent man had been offered and had declined such honours as are implied in a title or a decoration. He had acted as publisher for Queen Victoria, and his merits must therefore have been known to that singularly well-informed and sympathetic monarch. But the great publisher's interests were purely intellectual. He was Browning's bosom friend as well as the publisher of his poems. It was he who introduced the gifted Brontë sisters to the world, who placed Thackeray in the editorial chair of the *Cornhill*, who realised Captain Shandon's dream of a newspaper "written for gentlemen by gentlemen." Tennyson, Darwin, Matthew Arnold, Charles Lever, Thomas Hughes, George Eliot, Anthony Trollope—the names form an incongruous collocation, but Mr. Smith had known the bearers of them, had published for all of them, and was their common friend.

Another notable personality, sadly recalled by the week's obituary, was that of Mr. William Woodall, who for many years had been one of the foremost champions of the woman's rights movement. Mr. Woodall was a minor member of Mr. Gladstone's last administration and also of the short-lived Government of Lord Rosebery. He had been in Parliament exactly twenty years, obtaining election for the first time in 1880, and retiring at the dissolution of last year. During a considerable part of the last Parliament he was in feeble health, and took his place on the front Opposition bench only on occasions of the most pressing moment, or when questions especially affecting the welfare of women were under discussion. The unenfranchised sex are paying grateful tributes to the memory of their dead spokesman.

London is in a fever of artistic excitement over the recovery of the long-lost Gainsborough portrait of the Duchess of Devonshire. This famous picture, as all the world knows, was purchased twenty-five years ago by the Messrs. Agnew for £10,600, and soon afterwards was cut from its frame by an unknown thief and smuggled out of the country. If the portrait were indeed a speaking likeness the Duchess would have some strange stories to tell of her adventures during the last quarter of a century. Her abductor can have derived little advantage from his crime. Again and again, if the statements in circulation are to be credited, efforts have been made to exchange the booty for a fraction of its value, but always without avail. How the thief must have loathed his unmarketable prize! Meanwhile the painting has been steadily increasing in value, and now, what with its added fame and the normal appreciation of Gainsborough's work, it is probably worth about £20,000. The artist himself, it is interesting to remember, used to give his sketches and landscapes away to anyone who had assurance enough to ask for them, while at one period in his career his price for a half-length portrait was five guineas, and for a whole length eight guineas.

Despite the gloomy forecasts of the weather prophets, the Easter holidays on the whole have been favoured with bright skies and an abundance of sunshine. From some parts of the country come reports of a subdued demeanour on the part of the holiday crowds, due either to respect for the memory of the late Queen, or to an abiding consciousness of the long drawn-out agonies of the war. The London crowd takes the conditions of life more lightly. It believes that there is a time for weeping and a time for mirth, and it made merry on Easter Monday with all the capacity of its giant frame. A year ago, the events of the war loomed conspicuously in the national imagination and coloured with joy or sorrow the course of every festival. But the war is no longer a topic. One cannot say that it is popular or that it is unpopular. It has simply ceased to be interesting, and until De Wet is captured, or Botha surrenders, or conscription is proposed, the people of London, at least, will keep it out of their minds.

Among the new plays of the week the most unconventional is Mr. Russell Vaun's "Nicandra," a curious hotch-potch of supernaturalism and low comedy which the author not inaptly classifies as "mystical farce." The central idea is the hackneyed one that forms the mainspring of "Pygmalion and Galatea" and "Niobe all Smiles." A priestess of Isis, after a prolonged period of hibernation in the form of a snake, reassumes her human form in the drawing-room of a middle-class London household, and in a Puck-like spirit of mischief contrives to upset the love affairs of her new neighbours. Mr. Vaun fails to embroider the theme with any new device of fancy or invention, and consequently his play is rather dull. If it succeeds, in a popular sense, its success will be due to the serpentine grace with which Mrs. Brown-Potter invests the snake-woman. This impersonation is one of the weirdest things ever seen on the stage.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

THE "MANDATE" AND THE ARMY.

NO REMISSION OF TAXATION.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, March 23.

The most important topic of the week is of course the Budget for the coming year, with the salient features of which your readers are already acquainted from the official summary. Local criticism, I need hardly observe, is far from favourable. Both the *Times of India* and the *Advocate of India* describe the Budget as optimistic and challenge the propositions touching the "economic progress" on which a paragraph has been inserted in the introductory part of the Statement. I have not yet seen the leading up-country journals.

But the new Finance Minister has displayed, to my thinking, none of the financial statesmanship with which he was credited when he arrived among us twelve months ago. There is ample internal evidence of the comparative failure of Sir Edward Law to apprehend the real economic condition of the country. Whether he will understand it better at the end of four years, when he hands the financial portfolio to his successor, remains to be seen. I have my doubts.

But let me touch on some of the points made in the Introduction. We are told that the Budget will show an estimated surplus of a crore at the end of the next twelve months. There have been satisfactory increases in almost all the principal heads of revenue, owing to the alleged wonderful "recuperative" power of the country. The increases under the several heads, including net receipts from the newly acquired G. I. P. Railway, will come to about 1½ crore. *Per contra*, the increases in expenditure are four times as much. But as there are also several decreases and some savings, the net *increased* expenditure is estimated at about 1½ crore also. As to the increases *per se*, it would seem that the largest is to be discovered in the Army Charges. Out of the gross increase of 4·44 million "Rupee Pounds"—say 6 60 crores—as much as 3 crores are to be spent on the army for arms, ammunition, increased pay and so forth. These increases are not voluntary. They are to be made in obedience to a mandate from the War Office. Almost all the Finance Ministers who were examined by the Welby Commission expressed in turn their inability to control that part of Indian army expenditure which is incurred in England. They all deplored the Indian Government's lack of any voice in the matter. For better or for worse, India has been an unwilling partner in the business of army expenditure with the English War Office. The word of the War Office has to be obeyed without "if" or "but." Millions of money have thus been unnecessarily wrung from India since the fatal amalgamation scheme of 1859. Now in the current Budget the army is to be allowed a large expenditure of 3 crores. But the Financial Secretary, in the 251st paragraph of his Statement, observes that the causes of the increase "are beyond the control of the Government of India." Nearly a crore and a half is to be spent on new arms and ammunition. There is also to be a recurring expenditure of 33 lakhs, and we are comforted by the complacent prospect that, as factories for manufacturing munitions of war are to be established in India, the people will have the satisfaction of seeing that the monies spent will remain *in* India, thereby "increasing the productive power" and "training a large body of mechanics and other skilled artisans." Of this large expenditure of 3 crores half comes out of the savings caused by the despatch of part of the troops on foreign service. So that 1½ crore is what comes out from the Budget Estimates. But to the taxpayer this disposition of the army expenditure makes no difference. The expenditure is really 3 crores, though half of it is concealed by "savings."

Now, it will be noticed that in the whole of the Financial Statement there is not the remotest allusion to the remission of taxation either immediately or in the near future. They talk most magniloquently of the sympathy of the Government for the masses, the millions upon millions who earn a bare living wage and who find themselves in a season of bad harvests in the very jaws of death from starvation. Over 1¾ crores have been wrung from this class of the people by way of enhanced salt duty, at the rate of Rs. 2½ per maund, since 1889. Government after Government and Viceroy after Viceroy has announced that the duty would be remitted as soon as the finances allowed. There have been three different occasions on which the Government was in an excellent position financially to sacrifice the extra duty on salt, amounting to 1½ or 1¾ crore of rupees. But it deliberately chose to do nothing, but showered the bounty of its surplus on the army. Reference to the Statements for the years from 1892 to date affords ample corroboration of this fact. Now, apart from the past, this year was the year above all others when the Government could have easily afforded to remit eight annas of the salt duty, and still expended a crore on famine, with a small surplus. But it has again failed utterly to take into consideration the condition of the indigent masses. Instead it has chosen to pamper the army, as if new resources of civilisation were not being provided for it every year. Here are a crore and a half thrown heedlessly into the lap of the army while the millions of the poorest, who cannot get even one full meal a day, and who have been crying out against dear salt for the last ten years, are left out in the cold, even after the severest famine of the century, which has left them in a condition of extreme debility, and when the use of a little larger pinch of salt would go a great way to improve their strength.

Such callousness and such reprehensible neglect, in spite of solemn pledges, are indeed deplorable and tend to throw doubt on the sincerity of the conduct and attitude of the Government towards the masses—the same, be it remembered, at whose expense it has earned a profit of four crores on the coinage of rupees, a phenomenal profit, as the financial authorities themselves declare. The silver in the rupee is now 40 per cent. cheaper. All the same, it is issued to the public as if a tola of silver still cost sixteen annas. The unfairness of this artificial currency and the evils of the dishonest rupee have been frequently referred to in your columns and elsewhere.

But this brings me to the question of the currency itself. Alluding to the coinage of as many as fifteen crores of rupees during the last eleven months, the Finance Minister observes that it is "enormous and surprising." But the Government "have not gone beyond supplying possible demands." No. They have grown enormously and surprisingly wise after the event, aye, wise after the mischief their own hurried and ill-considered currency legislation of June 26, 1893, has wrought on the trade and industry of the country and on the economic condition of producers at large. But the irony of this action on the part of the Government becomes surpassing when in paragraph eighty-seven we are gravely informed by the Finance Minister "that there has been no hesitation on the Government to take every possible measure to provide all the necessary circulating medium which current demand has indicated as required for the business of the country." What a revelation to be sure. After closing the mints on the ground of alleged redundancy, which the country at large absolutely challenged, and after making all sorts of legislative shifts during a period of seven years, they awoke to the fact, which was patent all through, that a large, aye, "enormous and surprising" addition to the stock of rupees was necessary for the purposes of trade, which meanwhile had been allowed to go to the dogs amid the vigorous remonstrances of public mercantile organisations. And is it not too late in the day to offer the pledge to the public that they "will endeavour to maintain a stock of rupees in our currency reserve sufficient to satisfy all reasonably to-be-anticipated demands"?

But this is not enough by way of illustration of the Government's wisdom after the event. There are two further paragraphs (90 and 91) that need to be conned by Sir Henry Fowler and his colleagues, who were so sure about the maintenance of the gold standard with a gold currency. Those also who, like Sir Forbes Adam and others, not forgetting Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Dutt, strenuously opposed the measure, will no doubt read, mark, and inwardly digest the same passages. In 1893, at the height of the gold fever, it was vehemently contended that nothing short of drastic currency legislation would relieve the chronic financial embarrassment of the Indian Treasury—the alleged consequence of "low exchange." But the events of seven years seem to have had a sobering effect at headquarters. Reason and common sense have regained their ascendency. We are now seriously told that tampering with the currency by means of legislation is no good. In fact, the less legislation there is, and the more the currency is left to work out its salvation automatically, the better. Here is a pregnant observation: "I may observe that the effects of legislation are necessarily so restrictive that, though they may enforce automatic action under one set of conditions, they inevitably limit automatic action if those conditions are changed." Yet when the same plea was urged by the whole country—save a few enthusiastic apologists of the gold standard—that there was no need for legislation under panic, and that the currency of the day might be allowed to work out its own salvation under natural conditions, this opinion was condemned as short-sighted and in no way conducive to the achievement of the object in view. Such, however, is the irony of fate that what was condemned seven years ago comes to be approved to-day.

But here comes the crux of the question. If this is the opinion of the Government to-day, where was the necessity for the closure of the mints? Could not Government have obviated the necessity of coining as many as seventeen crores of rupees in a twelvemonth, with the evident desire to coin more in obedience to the business demand? For they might

have gone on coining silver at the rate of five crores and be no worse for the process, while trade throughout would have been eased and would never have been brought to that dismal pass from which even now it has not wholly emerged. Is not the present continued depression in the cotton, indigo, and tea industries the consequence of the original evil of the premature and ill-considered closure of the mints? This is, however, the way in which the financial affairs of this great country are managed. And they talk of "responsibility." Will Mr. Caine, now that he is to the front again in Indian affairs in Parliament, put the pertinent question to his colleagues on both sides of the House, Who is to be hanged for the currency measures of Government? And where is the person, or are the persons, on whom the responsibility of all the financial woes of the last seven years can be fixed? But I have exceeded my limits while I have said not a word about the "economic fallacies" of the Finance Minister in regard to the so-called economic "progress" of India. That topic deserves exhaustive consideration by itself.

AN INDIAN FAMINE UNION.

SUGGESTION BY SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN.

The following letter to the Editor appeared in the *Times* of Tuesday last (April 9):—

Sir,—I address you in the hope of inducing the British public to give a more definite shape to their undoubted sympathy with suffering India; my suggestion being that a national union should be formed, on a purely economic basis, having for its specific object to investigate the causes of Indian famines and to determine by scientific methods the direction in which practical means of prevention may most usefully be sought. This proposal does not include the question of relief when famine is already upon us. There the Government of India has done, and will do, its part in saving life and mitigating distress. But I am sure that there are many who feel that in this matter of Indian famines a responsibility also rests upon the British people, and that it is their duty to ascertain, by careful enquiry, whether these recurring disasters might not only be mitigated, but altogether averted. I trust that in putting forward this view I may be favoured with your powerful support. The problem is one of Imperial importance. It affects the lives and happiness of millions of our fellow-citizens, and well deserves the anxious attention of both the humanitarian and the economist.

The evil with which we have to deal is urgent; for in recent years these famines have recurred at ever-shortening intervals and with ever-increasing severity. The famine of 1897 was at the time pronounced to be the severest on record—although in 1876-79 there was a decrease of the population of Southern India, due to famine, amounting to five millions. But in 1900 things were still worse; and the Viceroy, Lord Curzon, declared that the famine of that year was "greater in intensity than any previously recorded visitation." And now, as regards the present year, we are warned that the crops in wide areas have again failed, and that famine is about to descend upon a population utterly exhausted by the sufferings of previous years. The matter is therefore of extreme urgency.

As regards the direction which the enquiry should take, may I point to one economic fact of the highest importance, which has not sufficiently occupied public attention? I refer to the great central fact that, even in the worst months of the famine, and in the worst localities, there has never been a deficiency in the food supply. There has always been a sufficiency of grain on the spot, in the hands of the traders; the difficulty is that the cultivators have no means to purchase. They have no money, and, being hopelessly in debt to the money-lender, have lost their credit. This extinction of credit is the new and dangerous feature which distinguishes recent famines from those of previous years; and it is to this point that our investigations should be specially directed. How the unhappy change has come about I will briefly indicate.

In former times the cultivator had three sure and simple safeguards against famine—his domestic hoard of buried grain, his family ornaments and (most important of all) his credit with the village money-lender, who is also the village grain dealer. Speaking from my own experience, I can say that 30 or 40 years ago the cultivator enjoyed the protection of these three safeguards. They are now all lost to him; the excellent custom of a domestic hoard has fallen into disuse; the family ornaments have long ago gone to the melting-pot; while his credit with the grain dealer is broken, because he already owes him far more than he can ever hope to pay. The consequence is that, although the bazaars are full of grain, the cultivator cannot purchase it, being destitute alike of coin and of credit. He is also too law-abiding to take it by force. When, therefore, his crop fails he and his family must be fed by charity or must die of hunger. As an example may be taken the district of Ahmedabad in Gujarat. There the people died in thousands. Yet Gujarat has been called the Garden of India; and the official returns show that in the Ahmedabad district, during the worst times of the famine, there existed in the hands of the traders "sufficient grain to last for a couple of years."

Under such circumstances I submit that the British people are bound to make some organised effort to understand the facts of the case; and that they are not justified in pronouncing Indian famines to be inevitable until they have carefully examined all reasonable proposals for a remedy.

I have, etc.,

W. Wedderburn.

Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W., April 6.

The *Morning Leader* wrote (April 10):—

There can, we imagine, be but one attitude towards the proposal made by Sir William Wedderburn in yesterday's *Times* for the formation of a National Union on a purely economic basis "having for its specific object to investigate the causes of Indian famines and to determine by scientific methods the direction in which practical means of prevention may be sought." True, a Famine Commission is now sitting in India. But it is limited to revision of the relief system, which (as Sir Lewis McIver would say) may safely be left to the Government of India. What that Government, for reasons best known to itself, has hitherto failed to do is to grapple in workmanlike fashion with the deeper problem of prevention. It now behoves the public at home, with whom the ultimate responsibility rests, to see that this duty is no longer neglected. Famines are becoming both more frequent and more severe in India. Yet, as Sir William Wedderburn points out, even in the worst months of the present famine, and in the worst localities, there has never been a deficiency in the food supply. The fact is that the wretched peasant is too poor either to buy or to borrow food. His domestic hoard of grain is a thing of the past. His family ornaments have long ago gone to the melting-pot. His credit with the money-lender is exhausted. "This extinction of credit," says Sir William, "is the new and dangerous feature which distinguishes recent famines from those of previous years." Here, then, is a sufficiently limited field for enquiry, which might be undertaken without great difficulty in a few typical Indian villages. We are often—quite often enough—told that Indian questions are not party questions. Well, here at least is a national duty of a purely economic kind in which men of all parties and of none should be able and eager to unite.

THE MORTALITY FROM FAMINE.

ANOTHER ESTIMATE.

The Simla correspondent of the *Standard* writes under date March 14:—

The Census Returns which have come to hand more than confirm the conjecture that the official estimate of three-quarters of a million as the loss of life due to the distress of last year is far short of the mark. In all probability at least five millions of people have died in India since 1896 from causes directly due to famine. Further returns received show that enormous decreases have been recorded in the districts of the Central Provinces affected by famine. Thus, Raipur is 144,000 short; Chanda, 108,000; Betul, 37,000; Patna, 54,000; and so on. The figures for the whole of the Central Provinces show a decrease of more than one million people as compared with 1891. In ordinary circumstances an increase of 1,500,000 might have been confidently expected, inasmuch as ten years ago the growth recorded was well over a million. It is certain, moreover, that up to 1896 the population increased at least in its normal proportion, as is shown by the returns of births and deaths. But in 1896 began that series of lean years which has worked such dire havoc throughout India. The famine of 1896-97 was very bad in the Central Provinces, and in some parts of Central India and the North-West Provinces. Hardly had the people begun to recover from its effects than the rains of 1899 failed almost entirely, with the inevitable result that the famine of 1900, the worst of which there is any record, overtook the sore-stricken people. And famine brought with it, in the Central Provinces as elsewhere, terrible epidemics of disease. Cholera swept off the people by thousands weekly, especially in the Eastern portions of the Provinces, such as Raipur and Bilaspur. The result of all this is apparent to-day.

Things are even worse in Western India. In places the

mortality, most of it last year, has been enormous. Thus Oodeypore State, in Rajputana, returns a decrease of no less than 840,000 people, or 45 per cent. of the population. In my letters last year I frequently referred to the mortality in this Native State, chiefly amongst the Bhils of the Southern portions. Now the actual loss has been made apparent it is possible to realise the terrible severity of last year's famine. Of course, a great deal of the mortality here, as elsewhere, is due to the cholera, which, coming as a hurricane on people enfeebled and hopeless after long months of semi-starvation, swept off thousands weekly. In the course of little more than one year this Rajput State has been put back more than a hundred years as regards population. And in the neighbouring States and districts things are almost as bad. Bhopal is 808,000 to the bad; Ajmere shows a decrease of 13 per cent.; Bandi, 124,000, or 42 per cent.; Banswara and Khusalgarh, 47,000, or 22 per cent.; Kishengarh, 34,000, or 27 per cent.; Jeysalmir, 40,000, or 35 per cent.; Merwara 10,000, and so on.

Taking Bombay Presidency, we find almost everywhere heavy decreases. Bombay town has lost 50,000, due chiefly to the plague and the exodus resulting therefrom. The plague mortality registered in Bombay during the last four and a half years is something like 70,000, and it is certain that the actual mortality must have been much greater. Many people have left Bombay on this account, and the result of the operation of these two causes has been the drop in population mentioned. But for the plague, Bombay would certainly have shown a population of well over 900,000 at this Census. As it is, the Western capital yields precedence to Calcutta, which has a population of well over 900,000: while if the neighbouring suburb of Howrah be included, the total will be something like 1,100,000. The principal decreases in the Bombay Presidency are as follows: Rewa Kantha Agency, 254,000; Satara District, 180,000; Broach, 50,000; Palanpur, 177,000; Bijapur, 61,000; Mahi Kantha, 220,000; Cambay, 14,000; Belgaum, 19,000; Bhor State, 18,000; Southern Mahratta jagirs, 24,000; and Cutch 71,000. In the neighbouring country of Berar, which also suffered severely from famine last year, a decrease of more than 12 per cent. is recorded in some districts. In the Nizam's dominions, close by, there has also been terrible mortality. Aurangabad shows a decrease of 109,000, or 13 per cent.; Nandi 131,000, or 20 per cent.; Parbhani 163,000, or 20 per cent.; and Naldrug 108,000, or 16 per cent.

In other parts of India, which have escaped the visitation of famine in its severest form, there has been a general increase. The Madras Presidency, for instance, returns a total population of 42,400,000, or an increase of nearly 8 per cent., as compared with 1891. Burma willal most certainly disclose a remarkable increase as the Province is in a very thriving condition. So, too, will Assam and Bengal, though some districts of the latter, notably Patna, Monghyr, and Shahabad, where plague has lately been very severe, return heavy decreases. The Punjab comes remarkably well out of the Census test. Famine raged in several Punjab districts more than once within recent years, and there was, undoubtedly, great mortality in the South-Western portions. Nevertheless, the Returns for the whole Province show that, including the subsidiary Native States, there is now a population of 26,887,000, as compared with 25,130,000 ten years ago. In British territory the population has increased by about 7½ per cent., but some of this is due to the enumeration of certain frontier districts for the first time. But for the famines of the last five years the increase would have been much greater. As it is, the comparative escape of the Punjab, as compared with other portions of India, is chiefly due to the magnificent system of irrigation which obtains throughout a large portion of the Province. This influence of irrigation is shown markedly, too, in the case of the North-West Provinces and Oude.

BOGUS "RECUPERATIVENESS" AND "SURPLUSES."

Trumpets are being blown with loud flourishes from many quarters about the sudden miraculous "recuperativeness" and "surpluses" of Indian revenue—and that, too, after the oft-repeated cry of Financial Ministers and other authorities for years and years as to the utter inelasticity of Indian finance, the oppressiveness of every addition to taxation, and the political danger of such oppressiveness. Meantime millions are perishing in India from famine, pestilence, and disease, for want of three-halfpence for a day's meal, and scores of millions are living on insufficient food from year's end to year's end in good seasons or bad.

Some light is thrown on this new phenomenon by the extracts given below from the two statements by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji which were submitted to the Currency Committee of 1898. Mr. Naoroji had, in order that his views might be tested, offered to be cross-examined. But the Committee refrained. These statements, however, are published by the Committee in the Appendix to their Report. (Those who desire to know the details of the grounds of Mr. Naoroji's points extracted below can obtain his pamphlets on application to the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, S.W.)

First may be given a few extracts from a letter written to the *Times* (June 3, 1898):—

Closing of the mints and thereby raising the true rupee worth at present about 11d. in gold to a false rupee to be worth about 16d. in gold *is a covert exaction of 45 per cent. more taxation (besides producing other effects which I do not mention) from the Indian taxpayers.* The reason is again simple. Suppose a rayat has to pay Rs. 10 for land tax. This rupee means a fixed quantity of silver stamped with the mint stamp, and is truly worth at present only about 11d. of gold. By closing the mints this rupee is forced up to the worth of 16d. of gold, and the rayat is compelled to find this high-priced false rupee of 16d. of gold, or, in other words, to sell 45 per cent. more of his produce to get this false rupee, *the Government thus getting 45 per cent. more taxation than it is entitled to, even according to its own "despotic" legislation.*

The introduction of a gold standard, while it will not save a single farthing or a single ounce of produce to the Indian taxpayer in his payment of "home charges," as explained above, will simply add more to his already existing grievous burdens (and injure him in other ways which I avoid mentioning here), to the extent of the heavy cost of the alteration. . . . . At present the whole controversy is based upon the assumption that closing of mints or introduction of a gold standard will produce to the Indian taxpayers an enormous saving in their remittances for "home charges." This, I say, is a mere fiction of the imagination and an unfortunate delusion.

Next follow some passages from Mr. Naoroji's first Statement of July 30, 1898, made to the Currency Committee:—

2. I may add that I am willing to submit to any cross-examination that may be considered necessary to test the correctness of my views, or to ask me other questions.

4. Closing the mints or introducing a gold standard does not and cannot save a single farthing to the Indian taxpayers in their remittance for "Home Charges" to this country. The reason is simple. Suppose we take roundly £20,000,000 sterling to be the amount of the "Home Charges." The Indian taxpayers have to send as much produce to this country as is necessary to buy £20,000,000, not an ounce less, no matter whatever may be the rupee or whatever the standard (gold or silver) in India. England must receive £20,000,000 in gold, or produce worth £20,000,000. The only way in which relief can come to the Indian taxpayers in these remittances is the rise in the prices of the Indian merchandise in this country, and not by any juggling with the currency laws of India.

5. The Government of India, in their despatch to the Secretary of State (Simla, November 9, 1878), themselves admit this in so many words—

"66. Now, it is plain that *so long as the amount of the so-called tribute is not changed the quantity of merchandise necessary to pay it will not change either*, excepting by reason of a change of its value in the foreign country to which it goes." (O 4868, 1886, p. 25.)

6. Closing of the mints, and thereby raising the true rupee, worth at present about 11d. in gold, to a false rupee to be worth 16d. in gold, *is a covert exaction of about 45 per cent. more taxation all round from the Indian taxpayers*, and at the same time of increasing the salaries of officials and other payments in India by Government to the same extent, and giving generally the advantage to creditors over debtors, the former being generally well-to-do, and the latter the poorer classes, especially in the case of the money-lenders and the rayats.

7. The real and full effect of the closing of the mints must be examined by *itself*, irrespective of the effect of other factors. First of all, the closing of the mints was illegal, dishonourable, and a despotic act. It is a violation of all taxation Acts, by which there was always a distinct contract between the Government and the taxpayers based upon the fundamental principle of sound currency—*i.e.*, of a certain definite rupee.

11. Now comes the false rupee. The true rupee, in its relation to gold at the present market value of silver of 184 grains, is worth, say, about 11d. of gold. Government intervenes, abuses its power or duty to coin silver unrestrictedly, makes the rupee scarce and false, and forces it up to the value of 16d. of gold, or about 269 grains of silver (including mintage), which the rupee does not contain. *And the taxpayer is compelled, by what Mr. Gladstone called "the argument and law of force," to pay his tax in this false rupee, under the false pretence of using the word "rupee" when this "rupee" is not one rupee, but nearly one and a half rupee.*

16. In the Treasury letter of November 24, 1879 (c. 4868, 1886, p. 31), to the India Office, my Lords say:—

17. "2. It appears to my Lords that the Government of India, in making the present proposal, lay themselves open to the same criticisms as are made upon Governments which have depreciated their currencies. In general, the object of such Governments has been to diminish the amount they have to pay to their creditors. In the present case, the object of the Indian Government appears to be to *increase the amount they have to receive from their taxpayers.* My Lords fail to see any real difference in the character of the two transactions."

18. " . . . . If, on the other hand, it is the case that the value of the rupee has fallen in India, and that it will be raised in India by the operation of the proposed plan, that plan is open to the objection that *it alters every contract and every fixed payment* in India."

21. "3. If the present state of exchange be due to the depreciation of silver, the Government scheme, if it succeeds, may relieve:

(1) The Indian Government from the *inconvenience of a nominal re-adjustment of taxation* in order to meet the loss by exchange on the home remittances:

(2) Civil servants and other Englishmen who are serving or working in India, and who desire to remit money to England:

(3) Englishmen who have money placed or invested in India which they wish to remit to England. *But this relief will be given at the expense of the Indian taxpayer*, and with the effect of increasing every debt or fixed payment in India, including debts due by *rayats to money-lenders*; while its effect will be materially qualified, so far

as the Government are concerned, by *the enhancement of the public obligations in India, which have been contracted on a silver basis. . . .* "

23. "It is no light matter to accept innovations which must sap and undermine that system, and my Lords have therefore felt it their duty plainly—though they hope not inconsistently with the respect due to the Government of India—to express their conviction that the plan which had been referred to them for their observations is one which *ought not to be sanctioned* by her Majesty's Government or by the Secretary of State." (Italics are mine.)

24. Can condemnation be more complete and convincing?

26. The whole basis of the action of the Government is, and was, the assumption that, as fall in exchange will necessitate increased burden of taxation, the closing of the mints and introduction of a gold standard will save the Indian taxpayer from any such additional burden of taxation which would otherwise arise enormously in the remittance of "Home Charges," and that it is imperatively necessary to establish a stable ratio between gold and silver. That the anxiety of the Government about increased burdens of taxation and its political dangers, and that to save the people from the former and the Government from the latter were the professed motives of all the present currency laws, would be clear from Government's own despatches.

27. In order not to encumber the statement here with the extracts from those despatches, I give them as Appendix B.

28. Both these objects, viz., saving people from additional taxation, and thereby Government from political danger, by the present proposals, and past currency legislation, are pure delusions.

29. It is not that the Government of India did not know this, or were not told this from the highest authority and others, and in distinct and emphatic terms. Of this I have already given (see *supra* 16 to 23 paras.) extracts from the despatch of the Treasury of November 24, 1879.

31. Lord Randolph Churchill wrote to the Treasury on January 26, 1886, and forwarded on March 17, 1886, a letter from the Government of India dated February 2, 1886 (c. 4868, 1886, pp. 3-5). To avoid repetition, I would not take extracts from these letters, as the reply of the Treasury embodies their views.

32. This reply of the Treasury is dated May 31, 1886 (signed Henry H. Fowler):—

34. "8. In December, 1878, Lord Cranbrook, then Secretary of State for India, forwarded to the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Stafford Northcote), without any expression of opinion, two despatches from the Government of India, containing certain proposed remedies for the evils arising out of the depression in the value of silver which were then in full force.

35. "9. This despatch and its proposals were submitted by Lord Cranbrook, on behalf of the Indian Government, and Sir Stafford Northcote, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, to a Committee consisting of Sir Louis Mallet, Mr. Edward Stanhope, M.P., Sir Thomas Seccombe, Mr. (now Sir Thomas) Farrer, Mr. (now Sir Reginald) Welby, Mr. Giffen and Mr. Arthur Balfour, M.P. These gentlemen reported, on April 30, 1879—'That having examined the proposals contained in the despatch, they were unanimously of opinion that they could not recommend them for the sanction of her Majesty's Government.'"

39. "'A perusal of the despatch leads to the conclusion that the Government of India are especially anxious to put an end to the competition of silver against their own bills as a means of remittance to India. But my Lords must ask whether this would be more than a transfer of their own burden to other shoulders; if so, *who would eventually bear the loss*, and what would be the effect on the credit of the Government and on the commerce of India.'"

40. The letter then further quotes the paragraphs, which I have already given before, pointing out that the relief wished for by the Government "*will be given at the expense of the Indian taxpayer.*"—(*Supra*, para. 21.)

55. The next natural question is—Why is it that fall in exchange should cause grievous troubles to India and not to any other self-governing, silver-using country? What is the real disease which creates all the never ceasing pains of India? The reply is given by Lord Salisbury in four words, "India must be bled" under a system of "political hypocrisy." As long as this is the fate of India under an un-British system of government, no jugglery, no loud professions of benevolence, no device of raising a rupee to what it is not worth, will cure India's sad fate and "terrible misery." (Lord Salisbury's words).

76. . . . In India the Government only thinks of the foreign "interests" (official and non-official) first, and of the subjects afterwards, if it ever thinks of the subjects at all when foreign "interests" are concerned.

These passages show how the bogus recuperative power is manufactured.

Below are some passages regarding "Surpluses and Solvency" from Mr. Naoroji's Second Statement (dated October 20, 1898), made to the Currency Committee:—

SURPLUSES AND SOLVENCY.

27. There never have been and never will be true surpluses or solvency of British India as long as the present evil system of government lasts. What is the surplus of the finance of any country? Suppose that in England you raise £100,000,000 of revenue. Suppose £95,000,000 are spent and £5,000,000 remain in hand at the end of the year; and this £5,000,000 is called surplus, and that the Government, if it does not impose any additional taxation or does not borrow, is solvent. Now, the essential condition of this surplus is that the whole of the £95,000,000 has returned to the taxpaying people themselves in a variety of ways, and continues to be the part and parcel of the wealth of the country. And the remaining £5,000,000 will also go back to the people and remain a part of the wealth of the country.

28. But what is the case with India? It is nothing of the kind. Suppose Rs. 1,000,000,000 are raised as revenue. Suppose Rs. 950,000,000 are spent, leaving Rs. 50,000,000 in hand at the end of the year. Now, are these Rs. 50,000,000 a surplus? No. The Rs. 950,000,000 have not all returned to the people and have not remained as part of India's *own* wealth. Some Rs. 250,000,000 (see paragraph 12) are drained clean out of the country by foreigners, never to return to India. Till these Rs. 250,000,000 are returned to India as its own, which they never are, and which is a dead loss, to talk of the surplus of Rs 50,000,000 is another gross abuse of language. Instead of Rs. 50,000,000 surplus there is a pure deficit or rather entire loss of Rs. 250,000,000. And such perpetual losses are pure bankruptcy.

29. I repeat, that there never has been and never will be any surplus in India, as long as, from every year's revenue, there is a clean drain which at present is at the rate of about Rs. 250,000,000. In this country all that is raised as revenue returns to the country, just as all water evaporating from the ocean returns to the ocean. And England's ocean of wealth remains as full as ever, as far as revenue is concerned. India's ocean, on the contrary, must go on evaporating and drying every year more and more.

30. The only reason why the Indian Government does not go into bankruptcy—bankrupt though it always is—is that it can, by its despotism, squeeze out more and more from the helpless taxpayer, without mercy or without any let or hindrance. And if at any time it feels fear at the possible exasperation of the people at the enormity it quietly borrows and adds to the permanent burden of the people without the slightest compunction or concern. Of course, the Government of India can never become bankrupt till retribution comes and the whole ends in disaster.

31. I have referred in the above consideration to the official bleeding only, but when to this is added the further exploitation of the land (meaning all the resources) and labour of the country, which I have already described, the idea of surplus or solvency, or of any addition to the wealth or prosperity of the *people* (however much it may be of the Europeans) becomes supremely ridiculous and absurd.

It is deplorable that the authorities should throw dust in the eyes of the British and the Indian public by their fiction of India's "recuperative power" and "surpluses."

THE OPTIMISM OF THE INDIAN BUDGET.

AN ANGLO-INDIAN PROTEST.

The *Times of India* writes (March 23):—

The tone of the Budget is optimist—provokingly so to people who are still living under the shadow of famine, pestilence, and commercial depression. Sir Edward Law could not have drawn up such an account of the condition and prospects of the country if he had been in Bombay during the last three months instead of in Calcutta. However, we must try on this side of India to believe that things are really better than they seem to us to be, and that, in the Financial Member's words, "we are entitled to look forward with some confidence to the future, and to hope for the early dawn of a period of considerable prosperity." . . . . Considering that Mr. Clinton Dawkins last year budgetted for virtually a full collection from the land, it is disquieting to learn that the difference between the original and the revised estimates is here only £382,000. This looks like a dangerously close collection, and it is surprising to find the Financial Member, considering all that the country has gone through, speaking of so small a sum as "a heavy deficiency." . . . . The estimates for the coming year are framed in the belief that a normal state of things is in store. Evidently Government wish the country to forget as soon as possible that it has just passed through a disastrous and destroying famine. Land revenue is budgetted for on a scale which would seem to assume that nothing has happened. For the country as a whole the land revenue estimate is £474,000 higher than that of the current year. We are told that the Government of India substantially reduced the revenue estimates of the local Governments in Bombay, the Central Provinces, and the Punjab—a noteworthy fact, seeing that it was proved before the Famine Commission the other day that the Bombay Government had twice rejected their own officers' proposals for large reductions in demand. It would seem, therefore, that some of the local administrations need to be under pressure from two sides in order to bring down their demands to a reasonable level—from their district officers on the one hand and from the Supreme Government on the other. Even now, despite the "substantial" reductions made by the Government of India, the demand is little below the normal, for the land revenue estimate for Bombay for the coming year is Rs. 4,31,04,000, or about 25 lakhs more than the collections of 1899-00. Everything will, of course, depend upon the extent to which the local administration will work up to the Budget estimate, and the Government of Bombay have indicated so clearly their intention to deal tenderly with the districts that have suffered most severely that it is difficult to see how this high figure can be reached. Sir Edward Law, speaking, however, of the estimate as a whole, assures us that it is unlikely to prove too sanguine. It seems to us to be too early to give any such assurance. Nor have we sufficiently recovered from our troubles to follow the Financial Member with hearty assent through his singularly cheerful review of the economic situation. The census, with its deplorable tale of retrogression, is in too recent memory to permit of a belief in the "general economic progress" of which Sir Edward Law sees indications in the steadiness of the salt

revenue, in the increased yield of the customs duties, and the almost inevitable growth of the Post Office revenue. Nor is it clear why he pointed in this connexion to "the unprecedented transport of food stuffs on the railways" as swelling railway receipts, and contributing "a useful addition of revenue wherewith to meet the demands of famine sufferers." This is a remarkable passage, for if it means anything it means that famine carries with it a hitherto unsuspected capacity for supporting its victims. It seems, indeed, difficult to read this part of the Financial Member's statement without feeling that the economic progress of India is a subject which might well have been deferred for treatment at a more convenient season.

The *Advocate of India* writes :—

We are cordially in agreement with one of our morning contemporaries, who says that the Finance Minister would have followed the counsel of perfection had he abstained at the end of the first year of his office, during which the agricultural masses, especially of Bombay and the Central Provinces, had suffered agonies which might move even the most stony-hearted to tears, from making comments on a difficult subject of which it may be reasonably doubted he has even learned the alphabet. It is India's misfortune that official statements on this subject, emanating from the higher quarters, have the mischievous tendency to mislead the British public at home. And we have not the slightest hesitation in asserting that this particular chapter on what purports to be economic progress is certainly misleading. It is vulnerable from many points, which we must take occasion from time to time to expose. The fact is that a most sweeping assertion is made as regards this so-called "progress" from the most superficial data. There is ample evidence in this monograph itself of the inconsistent position the Finance Minister has taken. It is a notorious fact, which not even the ablest member of the distinguished service, who has passed the best portion of his life in this country, will have the hardihood to deny, that there are millions of people in all parts of the Empire who are absolutely unable to stand up against a single bad harvest, let alone two, of the character which was witnessed two short years ago. And it will, again, hardly be denied that not only at such a time, but even during times of normal harvests these earn a wage which is no better than a bare living one. The lot of many is to content themselves with less than a full meal in twenty-four hours. Again, he must remember that millions have, during a scarcity or actual famine, to be fed, that remissions and suspensions of land revenue have to be given, and that the rayats do not recover for years, even with the State aid in the shape of *taccavi* advances.

Can any economist, in the face of these facts, which are to be witnessed in India from year's end to year's end, have the courage to say the country is making "progress"? Progress undoubtedly there is of a kind. We are triumphantly referred to the growing figures of imports and exports, to those of the savings bank, to the larger number of industrial and manufacturing concerns rising in our midst. These, say the optimists who talk of economic progress, are certain evidence of their statement. But in reality are they? We deny them. For when the economist comes to examine them he finds how fallacious they are. The State treasury may flourish in spite of a mountain of debt; the currency department may go on coining rupees at one rate and selling them to the people at another, with a profit ranging from 40 to 50 per cent.; all these and other superficial economic phenomena may exist, and yet the internal condition of those who are the real producers of the natural wealth may be anything but prosperous. A well-known writer has applied himself to the task of pointing out to the British public what that condition may be in the future, with recurrent famines and with the number of hungry mouths annually swelling. In his article entitled "The Great Indian Danger," which appeared in the *Spectator* eighteen years ago, he deliberately set about answering his optimist querists in the following terms. "We shall be asked how we reconcile these despondent views about the Indian cultivator with the admitted prosperity in many departments of Indian affairs. Just as we reconcile the condition of Donegal with the price of shares in the Bank of Ireland, or the condition of Essex farmers with the general state of British trade. There are states of society in which every class will prosper except the cultivator of the soil, and that state begins to exist over large sections of India. Tens of millions of persons there either can do or will do nothing but cultivation; and if cultivation does not pay, what hope have they? The traders do not buy more food of them for being rich, and they have only food to sell. They can get their clothes cheaper through free trade and railway, but they have reduced clothes to such an appreciable minimum that the saving is not a rupee per house. They need nothing else save land, and land, under the pressure of numbers, becomes so dear that either the profit per acre will not keep them or they get too few acres for maintenance. New occupations would save them, but they must be occupation for millions, and where are they? . . . . Indian trade might be doubled and all Indian traders made rich, and yet the pressure of ever-increasing multitudes upon the soil of Bengal and the Deccan might in a bad year produce famine or a distress amidst which society would dissolve. Five people cannot live and pay a direct tax in money and the interest of old debts upon five acres of over-cropped soil without danger in bad years of catastrophe. That is the position of whole districts in India, and the comparative wealth of other districts is nothing to the purpose." Here is the whole economic problem given in a nutshell. We cannot improve on it, though we may add our own commentary to it in further support of this absolutely correct view of the economic condition of the masses.

MR. G. P. PILLAI ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

[From a Correspondent]

The third week of the Indian campaign in Lancashire and adjoining counties opened on March 25 with a lecture by Mr. G. P. Pillai in the Attercliffe division of Sheffield, on "The Condition of Indians in South Africa." He pointed out that the Natal Government had passed several Acts against Indians. Their Quarantine Act is described by Sir Lepel Griffin as a "quarantine law of exceptional severity, obviously directed, not against contagious diseases, but against immigration." Their Immigration Restriction Act was characterised by Sir Harry Binns as being "not straight," and "un-English." Their Licence Act denied the right of trading to Indians unless they knew English. Their Act about passes made every Indian liable to arrest unless he armed himself with a pass. Their Franchise Act excluded Indians from the Parliamentary franchise. Their Vagrancy Law justified the arrest of any Indian if found in the streets after nine p.m. Their law about Indian labourers had been described by some colonial politicians as a "cruel wrong to Indians." Not satisfied with these measures, the Government of Natal contemplated the introduction of a measure preventing Indians from acquiring land. The Cape Colony had authorised the towns of Kimberley and East London to frame bye-laws for confining Indians to locations, and preventing them from walking on footpaths or bathing in certain parts of the rivers. The Prime Minister had now framed a bill for restricting the immigration of Indians. If India should continue to be a part and parcel of the Empire, as all Indians wished, it was necessary that all these disabilities should be removed and greater confidence placed in Indians.

On March 26 Mr. Pillai lectured at Hollingsworth on "The Poverty of India."

On March 27 he returned to Sheffield and addressed two meetings kindly arranged by Mrs. Wilson, wife of Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., in the Brightside division of Sheffield. At the afternoon meeting, which was attended by women only, Mrs. Wilson presided, and delivered a graceful little speech expressing her great sympathy for India. At the large meeting in the evening Mr. Wilson, one of the sons of Mr. H. J. Wilson, presided. The following notice of the meetings appeared in the *Sheffield Independent* :—

On Wednesday two drawing-room meetings, arranged by the Brightside Women's Liberal Association, were held at Osgathorpe Hills, the residence of Mr. Henry J. Wilson, M P., when interesting addresses were given on Indian questions by Mr. G. P. Pillai, B.A., F.R. Hist. Soc., editor of the *Madras Standard*, who is at present engaged in addressing meetings in different parts of the country under the auspices of the National Reform Union. The first of the meetings was held in the afternoon, and was attended by members and friends of the Brightside Women's Liberal Association. Mr. Pillai spoke on the question of the Indian famine. In the evening the attendance was more general and included a number of well-known Liberals. The subject taken was "The Awful Poverty of India," which was handled by Mr. Pillai with considerable skill. He quoted statistics and authorities to show the marked contrast between the poverty of India and the condition of things in England, that whilst the average income in England is about £40 a year, in India it is only some £1 13s. 6d. Further, the Indians are taxed to the extent of 9 per cent. of their small incomes, whilst in England the corresponding taxation only amounts to about 6 per cent. He complained that the positions of responsibility in the higher services of the Crown are filled by Europeans almost to the exclusion of Native gentlemen, who could be found to possess the necessary education and training in such numbers as to considerably reduce the expenses if their services were more largely utilised, as the salaries required by Natives were on a very much lower scale than that paid to English officials sent out from home. The speaker said that they in India looked to the Liberals of this country for help in getting their grievances redressed, remarking that whilst that party had been instrumental in obtaining better conditions for the people at home, so it was that they in India owed to the same party whatever measures of reform and progress had come to them.—At the close of the address a large number of questions were asked and a considerable fund of additional information was elicited on various phases of Indian life. A hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Mr. Pillai for his address, those present expressing their pleasure at having been able to hear at first hand the position so admirably put before them by a Native gentleman of the standing and calibre of the lecturer.

On Thursday, March 28, Mr. Pillai addressed a public meeting at Darwen on "India and Famine." A report of his speech was published in the *Blackburn Standard*.

On March 29 Mr. Pillai proceeded to Southport where he again spoke on the "Famine Problem in India." Reports of the meetings were published in the *Southport Guardian* and the *Southport Visitor*. The following account is from the *Southport Guardian* :—

The committee of the Southport Women's Liberal Association arranged last evening a lecture on "Famine in India" by Mr. G. P. Pillai, B.A., a Native of India. The event took place in the Temperance Institute. Owing to the very wintry weather and the miserable condition of the roads, the attendance was exceedingly small. Dr.

Backwell Fenn presided, and pointed out that during the last ten years there had been an increase of only about seven millions in the population of the whole of India. This was, of course, very small. In certain districts where rain was abundant and the rice crops good the population were prosperous and increased; but in other parts the population had decreased. Only those who had been in India and seen with their own eyes the horrors of famine could form any adequate idea of what these figures meant.

Mr. Pillai said the close connexion of this constituency and this part of England with India was, he thought, in itself a justification for his presence there for the purpose of addressing a few words to them on India. Looking at the exports from Lancashire to India during the past five years, it would be seen that there had been a reduction of five millions. This was due to the fact that the country had been subject to famine, and the Natives were not able to spare money to buy our goods. It was, therefore, not in the interests of the people of India alone that attention ought to be paid by the people of England to the ever-recurring famines. Comparing the goods exported to Australia and India from this country, he said the vast difference shown was due to the fact that the people of India were so poor that they were not in a position to pay for the goods which under other circumstances they would be only too glad to buy. There could not be a more serious indictment of British rule than the periodical famine which had caused such ravages in India. One of the real causes of famine was the actual poverty of the people. The average annual income of a Native of India was not more than £1 13s. 6d., whilst the average income of an Englishman was £40 a year. If the people were so poor, he believed it was only fair that they should not be highly taxed. But what were the facts? In this country the rate of taxation was six per cent. of the average income of a man; in India the Government took nine per cent. Another cause of famine was the heavy land tax. In olden times no Hindoo ruler ever took more than one-sixth, or 16 per cent., of the produce from land in the shape of tax; but in certain parts of India the Government took from 25 to 31 per cent. There was still another cause of the ever-recurring famines in India, and that was the constant drain upon its finances. Supposing twenty millions of money were taken away year after year from this country, he doubted whether we should be able to stand it. Yet it was precisely what was going on in India. The people of India had to find £250,000 with which to pay the Secretary of State for India and his Council, whilst the Colonial Office was provided for by the British taxpayers. That was only one of the items of money which was taken from the people of India and utilised in this country. Combining all these circumstances, was it surprising that India should fall such an easy prey to famine? They were told by the Viceroy of India that they were on the threshold of another famine this year. Why did the Government take such a large amount of money from the people of India? Because the Government of India happened to be the costliest Government in the world. Besides its highly-paid civil service, there had been eight wars and expeditions during the last fifty years, in every one of which the taxpayer in India had been compelled to send his own army and pay in every case at any rate a part of the charges. Only the other day the Secretary of State for India confessed that 27,000 soldiers belonging to the Indian Army were employed outside India. India afforded the best example of a burdened taxation without representation. They firmly believed that the key to India was to be found at Westminster, but unfortunately the House of Commons was utterly indifferent to the demands of the people of India.

The campaign closed on March 29. In the space of nineteen days Mr. Pillai addressed fifteen meetings in thirteen different towns, seven in Lancashire, three in Cheshire, three in Yorkshire and two in Derbyshire. Five of these meetings were arranged by Women's Liberal Associations and the remaining ten by Liberal Clubs. Unfortunately for Mr. Pillai, the whole of the time the meetings lasted the weather was very cold. In addition to the severe east winds there was a heavy snowfall on some days.

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

For the convenience of many readers in India we transcribe from the Rules and Orders of the House of Commons the following passages relating to public petitions:—

437. Petitions to the House must be fairly written, without interlineation or erasure; and no printed or lithographed Petition will be received.

By an Instruction to the Select Committee on Public Petitions of February 15, 1881, it is ordered, That they have power in the case of Petitions from India, to receive and print Petitions, which may be informal under the Rules of the House, if it shall appear to the Committee that the informality is due to inadvertence or ignorance of the Rules.

438. Each Petition must conclude with a prayer.

439. Petitions must be signed by at least one person, on the skin or sheet on which the Petition is written.

440. Petitions must be written in the English language, or be accompanied by a translation, certified by the Member who presents it.

441. Petitions must be signed by the parties whose names are appended thereto, by their names or marks, and by no one else, except in case of incapacity by sickness.

442. The signatures must be written upon the Petition itself, and not pasted upon, or otherwise transferred thereto.

In the Sessional appointment of the Select Committee on Public Petitions, it is ordered, That the Reports of the Committee do set forth the number of Signatures to each Petition, only in respect to those Signatures to which addresses are affixed.

443. By Resolution, June 2, 1774, it is highly unwarrantable, and a breach of the Privilege of this House, for any person to set the name of any other person to any Petition to be presented to this House.

444. Petitions of Corporations aggregate must be under their common seal.

445. No letters, affidavits, or other documents, may be attached to any Petition, save in the case of a Petition for compounding a debt to the Crown.

446. No reference may be made in a Petition to any Debate in Parliament, nor to any intended Motion, unless a notice of such Motion stands upon the Notice Paper of the House.

Petitions also may be received against Bills imposing Taxation, in accordance with Rule No. 465.

447. No application may be made by a Petition for a sum relating to Public Service, for compounding sums of money due to the Crown, for the remission of duties payable by any person, nor for a charge upon the Revenues of India, unless the Petition be recommended by the Crown.

Nor can such petition be proceeded upon save in Committee of the whole House, and after adjournment of the matter to a future day.

448. This House does not receive a Petition for compounding any sum of money owing to the Crown, upon any branch of the Revenue, without a certificate from the proper officer or officers annexed to the said Petition, stating the debt, what prosecutions have been made for the recovery of such debt, and setting forth how much the Petitioner and his security are able to satisfy thereof.

451. Every Petition is to be respectful, decorous, and temperate in its language.

461. A Member who offers to present a Petition to the House, not being a Petition for a Private Bill, or relating to a Private Bill before the House, confines himself to a statement of the parties from whom it comes, of the number of signatures attached to it, and of the material allegations contained in it, and to the reading of the prayer of such Petition.

462. Every Petition not containing matter in breach of the Privileges of this House, and which, according to the rules or usual practice of this House, can be received, is brought to the Table by the direction of the Speaker, who shall not allow any Debate, or any Member to speak upon, or in relation to, such Petition; but it may be read by the Clerk at the Table, if required.

463. In the case of such Petition complaining of some present personal grievance, for which there may be an urgent necessity for providing an immediate remedy, the matter contained in such Petition may be brought into discussion on the presentation thereof.

464. All other such Petitions, after they are ordered to lie on the Table, stand referred to the Committee on Public Petitions, without Question put.

If such Petition relates to any matter or subject, with respect to which the Member presenting it has given notice of a Motion, and the said Petition has not been ordered to be printed by the Committee, such Member may, after notice given, move that such Petition be printed with the Votes.

A Petition may be referred to a Select Committee on the subject to which the Petition relates.

465. Subject to the above Regulations, Petitions against a Resolution or Bill imposing a tax or duty for the current service of the year, may be received, and the usage under which the House has refused to entertain such Petitions is discontinued. *See also* Rule No. 446.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

On May 5 at the Brixton Discussion Forum (Raleigh College Hall, Saltoun Road, Effra Road, Brixton, at 11.30 a.m.), Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will give an address on the "Condition of India."

In connexion with the North West London Democratic Peace Union, a lecture on "India and Her People" will be given in the Lecture Hall, Stanfield House (the Library, Prince Arthur Road, Hampstead), by Mr. Martin Wood on Monday, April 15, at 8 p.m. Mr. S. H. Swinny will preside.

We take the following from the *Castle Street Congregational Church Magazine* (Reading):—

Not often in these "degenerate" days have we seen Castle Street packed to overflowing as it was on Sunday afternoon, March 10 when Broad Street P.S.A. joined us at our meeting to hear an address on "India" from the celebrated Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. By three o'clock every seat was taken, and still they came. Some few had the distinguished honour of occupying the top gallery not used for many years past. Several went away disappointed of a seat.

The meeting can hardly have failed to do good. The very presence of so large a number was an inspiration.

The address from Mr. Naoroji was certainly not calculated to soothe and comfort us, but it was a most excellent test of our patience, our sympathy, our humility; and in these days when so much empty talk is indulged in concerning "Empire and Imperialism" and "England's glory," it is a healthy antidote to be reminded of our shortcomings, our unfulfilled promises and our high responsibilities in regard to our distant possessions. Altogether it was an afternoon which will leave its good effect upon all present.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.
Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.
Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.
The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.
A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.
India and the General Election (1900).
"Melancholy Meanness."
The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.
No National Contribution?
The "Sliminess" of the India Office.
"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to "INDIA" 1901.

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE NOW?

A limited number of new Subscribers can still be supplied with copies of INDIA from the beginning of the present year. SUBSCRIPTIONS (POST FREE) SIX RUPEES.

PREPAID Subscriptions for the REMAINDER OF THE YEAR should be remitted direct to the Office in London at the following rates, which include postage:—

April 1 to end of year..5 rupees.
May 1 to end of year..4 rupees 9 annas.

Do you want to know by every mail what has been done in Parliament concerning India?

Do you want to see special reports of public meetings in England concerning India?

Do you want to read what the British Press is writing about India?

——The Journal "INDIA" will tell you.

Remittances should accompany every order.
Address:—THE MANAGER OF "INDIA," 84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

INDIAN FAMINES:
Their Causes and Remedies.
BY PRITHWIS CHANDRA RAY,
(Author of "The Poverty Problem in India," etc., etc.).
To be obtained in England (price 1s. 1d. post free) from 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster.
In India: by V. P. Post, from P. C. RAY, 45-5, BENEATOLA LANE, CALCUTTA.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S
PECTORAL BALSAM.
A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.
For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.
DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.
P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England:—
April 1 to End of Year (Post free), 7s. 3d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.